Appeal: 12-7812 Doc: 14 Filed: 03/08/2013 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7812

TITUS LAMONT BATTS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN OAKS,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:12-hc-02106-F)

Submitted: February 22, 2013 Decided: March 8, 2013

Before WILKINSON and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Titus Lamont Batts, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Titus Lamont Batts seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Batts has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Batts' motions to appoint counsel, for a certificate of appealability, and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and we dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

Appeal: 12-7812 Doc: 14 Filed: 03/08/2013 Pg: 3 of 3

materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED